

ARCHIVE COPY

ASE 96-9
C.1

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

National Defense University

National War College

**CIVILIAN-MILITARY COOPERATION
AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE:
LESSONS FROM RWANDA**

John E. Lange, Class of 1996

Paper Sponsor: Col James Reed

Faculty Adviser. Mr Hugh DeSantis

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 1996		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-1996 to 00-00-1996	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Civilian-Military Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance: Lessons from Rwanda			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National War College, 300 5th Avenue, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, DC, 20319-6000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT see report					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 27	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Introduction

On July 22, 1994, President Clinton announced that the United States would contribute massive relief assistance to Rwandan refugees in response to an appeal from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The greatly-increased level of U.S. humanitarian support would be provided primarily by the military. The Department of Defense quickly responded, and its rapid reaction has been highly commended for saving thousands of lives.

The military effort, dubbed Operation Support Hope, evinced significant differences in perspectives between the military and civilian organizations involved. There were concerns among the senior military leadership and key Members of Congress that the operation detracted from military readiness. On the other hand, there were concerns among many civilians, particularly in the humanitarian community, that the military's successful effort to terminate the operation quickly did not match public U.S. commitments of support for Rwandan refugee relief.

Since that time, several "lessons-learned" exercises have focused on improving military-civilian coordination in humanitarian operations. These efforts should continue, particularly given the certainty that the military will be called upon again to support humanitarian relief efforts when they exceed the capacity of humanitarian agencies to handle. Improved planning and coordination is particularly important between armed forces and the international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which specialize in humanitarian relief.

Those who engage in such efforts within the U.S. Government, however, should be under no illusions: there is a basic cultural difference between how the U.S. military and the civilian humanitarian agencies view emergency relief. There will inevitably be great tension between the two because the U.S. military looks on such an operation as secondary in importance to its basic mission of warfighting, while the civilians involved see their primary mission as protecting and

assisting innocent civilians. This inherent tension should give pause to U.S. military leaders, whose new vision for the future includes the ability to dominate military operations involving humanitarian assistance as part of "full spectrum dominance" (Joint Chiefs 17)

A Massive Emergency, and the President Responds

Some 500,000 to 800,000 refugees fled from Rwanda into Zaire in July 1994. Initial estimates at the time were as high as 1.2 million people in the period July 14-17. This sudden and massive outflow of refugees overwhelmed the ability of relief agencies to provide water, food, medical care, shelter and other relief items (Goma Group, 339). On July 15 in Geneva, Switzerland, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, Mrs. Sadako Ogata, addressed an emergency meeting of the Humanitarian Liaison Working Group (HLWG, consisting of 24 donor governments and the European Commission) to alert the assembled ambassadors of the impending disaster and to explain that she soon would be calling on governments for specific assistance.

By July 20, UNHCR had hastily put together a list of eight self-contained (and ill-defined) "service packages." High Commissioner Ogata requested that donor governments provide the specified assistance as in-kind contributions. Many of the packages were geared to the kinds of operations which could be accomplished by military establishments: airport services, logistics base services, road servicing and road security, site preparation for refugee camps, provision of domestic fuel for cooking, sanitation facilities, water management, and airhead management (UNHCR memo 2-4).

The U.S. Government was quick to respond. On July 22, President Clinton held a news conference at the White House. He reported that

...The flow of refugees across Rwanda's borders has now created what could be the world's worst humanitarian crisis in a generation. It is a disaster born of brutal violence, and according to experts now on site, it is now claiming one life every minute. Today, I have ordered an immediate, massive increase of our efforts in the region, in support of an appeal from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2)

He said the efforts would be directed "from the White House" through the National Security Adviser working with the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (The State Department was notably absent from the list.) The President explained that the Defense Department would "establish and manage an airlift hub in Uganda,...assist in expanding airlift operations near the refugee camps in Goma and Bukavu,.. establish a safe water supply, and ..distribute as much water as possible to those at risk." In response to a question, he reported the cost would be "in excess of \$100 million." (1, 3)

Operation Support Hope quickly commenced. On July 25, the Director of the Rwanda Task Force in the Department of Defense and others testified before the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee and received full support for the undertaking. Senator Exon (D-Neb.) lamented the magnitude of the tragedy and said that the U.S. "should be saluted" for doing something about it (U.S. Senate 24). Committee Chairman Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) expressed his agreement and then added:

...in the military, when you are sitting around in war colleges and so forth, this is not what you undertake as your mission, and this is not the kind of contingency you planned. The U.S. military is the only organization in the world that can bring to

bear this kind of relief effort in a short time frame in an emergency situation (U.S. Senate 24)

Marine Corps Lieutenant General John Sheehan, Director for Operations of the Joint Staff, told the committee that the military effort would last until November or December "We are putting into place a logistics network that will take us a full month or so to put into place, and then we expect to sustain it at least for three or four months" (U.S. Senate 28)

Initial Military Reluctance

Official Executive branch pronouncements of support for the humanitarian operation masked serious misgivings on the part of the U.S. military. According to a senior government official involved in the effort,

It was clear from the beginning the JCS was not a willing participant. If they had their "druthers," they wouldn't have been involved in the effort at all. DOD, specifically JCS, were "naysayers" who didn't want to do it. That's why Tony [National Security Adviser Anthony Lake] got the President involved. JCS had been putting up roadblocks not to engage in any way (Senior official).

Such concerns became public after the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Shalikashvili, met with reporters on July 28. He was quoted as saying, "We have a capacity like almost no one else to help with tragedies of a magnitude like we're witnessing now in Rwanda. But we also at the same time need to strengthen the United Nations so they can do more on their own without always having to call upon us or we don't have to play as large a part." (Graham A29) The newspaper report of the meeting explained the JCS thinking at the time:

While proud to help save the starving and shelter the homeless around the world, Defense Department officials cringe at the notion of becoming a super, musclebound Red Cross or Salvation Army. Such humanitarian missions are fine now and then, Pentagon officials say. But these operations sap time and attention of senior officials, cut into combat training exercises, tie up equipment and personnel and take increasingly scarce defense dollars away from other operations focused on the Pentagon's primary mission of making sure U.S. armed forces remain strong enough to win two regional wars nearly simultaneously (Graham A29).

Despite the military's misgivings, the President's policy remained in place

Misgivings Among Key Members of Congress

On July 29, the Defense Department announced that it was sending additional troops for the Rwandan aid effort. The administration also asked Congress for supplemental appropriations totalling \$320 million (\$270 million for defense and \$50 million for foreign operations). About the same time, both Republican and Democratic members of Congress "criticized the Clinton administration for failing to adequately and speedily deal with the civil war and refugee crisis" (Fleming 2158).

Others in Congress, however, were sending different signals. Led by Chairman Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), the Senate Appropriations Committee approved only \$170 million of the defense supplemental appropriation; Byrd said that the funds were sufficient to get the operation off to a start and that the President could ask Congress for additional monies before it adjourned in October. The bill also would require that U.S. forces be withdrawn by early October unless Congress specifically approved a longer stay. Byrd crafted limitations on use of the relief money

to forestall any expansion of U S. operations to establish security inside Rwanda, telling the committee that "We had enough of that in Somalia" (Towell 2159)

In the latter half of August, key Pentagon supporters in Congress expressed their concerns about the military mission. On August 24, 1994, Senator Strom Thurmond, ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, wrote a letter to the President urging that humanitarian operations be paid from a separate account, rather than from "the already anemic defense budget " Three days later, a newspaper article citing administration officials and congressional sources criticized the Clinton administration's "open-ended commitments [for the Pentagon's Rwandan relief mission and refugee interdiction in the Caribbean] costing millions of dollars a day without agreement on how to pay for them" (Lippman A10)

Regarding the termination date of Operation Support Hope, an officer who worked with the operation in the Pentagon confirmed that "budget was part of the bureaucratic reinforcement of the perception of mission responsibilities" (Joint Staff officer).

Civilian-Military Debate over U.S. Commitment

During the height of the relief effort, frequent international consultations were held on the political, economic, military and humanitarian aspects of the Rwanda crisis. On August 2, an international donors pledging conference was held at the United Nations in Geneva. In his speech, Richard McCall, head of the U S. delegation and chief of staff to the USAID Administrator, described the international relief effort and the U S actions "to implement four of the eight service packages requested " He mentioned the request to Congress for supplemental appropriations and noted that "much of this will be used to continue managing the four service packages on behalf of UNHCR " He also reported that

Secretary of Defense William Perry visited Kigali and the refugee camps around Goma this past weekend. Upon returning to Washington yesterday, Secretary Perry reported that, thanks to the collective relief efforts, the corner has been turned, but much work remains to be done (McCall 1-2)

Joint Task Force Support Hope proved critical to the expeditious delivery of humanitarian relief. By August 12, a news report out of Kigali said that "most American soldiers probably will leave Goma, Zaire, within weeks, senior U S officers here say." Lt Gen Daniel Schroeder, Commander of the Joint Task Force, was quoted as saying, "The Goma piece, I think, is settled. Our water production is now at the point where it is exceeding consumption" (Vogel A12). Reinforcement of this view came from discussions with UNHCR officers on the scene, who apparently were not always in full agreement with their headquarters. The official UNHCR view was strikingly different. On August 11, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees Gerald Walzer wrote to the U S Ambassador to International Organizations in Geneva to explain that much more needed to be done. "Substantial support will be needed in the water sector until production goals are achieved in all areas and distribution systems are fully established and sustainable" (Walzer).

By mid-August, it was increasingly clear that organizational perspectives on the relief operation in eastern Zaire differed dramatically between the Department of Defense on one side and the Department of State and the Agency for International Development on the other.

From the military perspective, the worst was over and it would soon be time for an expeditious transfer to relief agencies. In mid-July, Zaire had witnessed one of the worst humanitarian crises imaginable: up to 800,000 refugees had crossed the border in the course of four days and arrived in a remote area of volcanic rock with insufficient water and food, almost 50,000 refugees (between six and ten percent) died during the first month after the influx. By the second month, however, "a well-coordinated relief programme" was associated with a steep

decline in death rates" to one-fourth of the earlier level (Goma Group, 339-342) The U.S military, with its unmatched logistical capability, had provided the necessary surge capacity which international relief agencies lacked for a crisis on such a massive scale As one military officer involved in the operation put it, once the dying stopped and the infrastructure was established, "our mission was over" and resources which had been diverted to Operation Support Hope could be applied to "more appropriate tasks " In his view, "the military didn't perceive this as a true mission" because there was no security factor involved, as there was in Somalia or Haiti (Joint Staff officer)

The civilian agencies, however, had a different outlook They were accustomed to dealing with refugee and migration crises, but this was one of the worst in history It seemed less and less likely that the refugees (primarily Hutus) would return to Rwanda anytime soon. Extremists, many of whom had committed genocide, were living in the refugee camps Meanwhile, Rwanda itself had been devastated by the horrific genocide and the government takeover by the Rwandan Patriotic Front (led by Tutsis). The prospects for further conflict appeared to be high During the second month of the crisis, five to eight refugees out of every 10,000 were dying each day, and this was still way above the crude mortality rate (0.6 per 10,000 per day) in Rwanda prior to the conflict (Goma Group 340) Thus, from the perspective of State and USAID (and many NGOs), this looked to be a long-term situation requiring large-scale humanitarian and development resources and an extraordinary commitment on the part of the international community This context made it even more important that the U S. Government meet its July policy commitment to provide four of the "service packages" requested by UNHCR As to the critical water package, there was a lengthy debate in Washington regarding the minimum number of liters of water needed per person per day in a humanitarian emergency (Borton) Key civilians believed that the departure of the military should take place only after internationally-accepted standards for water production and distribution were met, and that there should be a seamless transition as the military departed In the view of a State Department refugee official, it was important to look objectively

at the situation on the ground rather than simply "define the crisis as over so the military could leave" (McKelvey).

UNHCR, with its responsibility to care for the refugees after the initial crisis passed, considered it vital to maintain continuity in the humanitarian relief operation after withdrawal of Operation Support Hope. At the request of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the Counselor for Refugee and Migration Affairs at the U.S. Mission in Geneva (the author) met on August 16 with UNHCR staff and was presented with an urgent request for information on U.S. plans and intentions in order to identify resource gaps and priorities in the coming weeks. The U.S. Government response, which was transmitted to Geneva two and a half weeks later, made U.S. intentions clear.

.. The U.S. commitment "to carry out" the service packages will not necessarily continue .. The U.S. committed its military forces to several UNHCR packages on an urgent, crisis-response basis. As NGOs, under the guidance of UNHCR, are accepting responsibility for these packages on a continuing basis, the U.S. military is being withdrawn.... U.S. forces withdrew from Goma on 26 August after having handed over operations to UNHCR et al on the ground. Provided the situation remains stable we expect to restructure the U.S. military presence in the region to handle remaining missions -- essentially airlift -- with greatly scaled-down presence at Entebbe and Kigali .. Planning considerations: (a) our goal is to have no residual military presence in the area, (b) U.S. military support should be considered only if it is a unique, military capability not found in IOs, NGOs or other countries (U.S. Mission response 1-2).

Two days later, a Washington Post report citing U.S. and international relief officials criticized the Defense Department's organizational response to the President's commitments in July.

The discrepancy between the White House's promises and the Pentagon's performance was due to a combination of the administration's reluctance to insist that the military meet each U.N. task and the military's judgment that the tasks were either too costly, too risky or unnecessary. . [The projected end-September withdrawal] is earlier than some U.S. diplomats and many international relief workers favor. Moreover, the military plans to depart after performing only a portion of the four principal humanitarian tasks that National Security Adviser Anthony Lake and other senior officials in July pledged publicly it would undertake (Smith A1, A16).

The article also provided a clue as to why the President and the National Security Council had allowed such bureaucratic politics to proceed: "Senior administration officials who would ordinarily closely monitor the military's performance were distracted by crises in Cuba and Haiti" (Smith A1)

Not surprisingly, the article caught the attention of officials in Washington. The Department of Defense prepared a response, stating.

There is no discrepancy between the tasks identified by President Clinton and what the USG delivered. DoD has essentially completed the specific tasks directed by the President on 22 July speech (sic), and has done so in full coordination with the UNHCR. The President defined DoD's general objective as the alleviation of the immediate suffering of Rwandan refugees. Toward that end, he directed DoD

contribute *in a significant way* to four of the eight so-called "service packages" requested of the international community by the UNHCR. (U S Department of Defense; emphasis added)

There is a notable contrast in phraseology between McCall's August 2 speech saying the U.S. would "implement" four of the service packages versus the Defense Department's view a month later that the military was tasked to "contribute in a significant way" to four of the packages. That contrast serves as a microcosm of the civilian-military debate over the extent of the U S commitment.

Soon afterward, with most of the Rwandan refugees remaining in Zaire, the U S military - whose operation had been announced with great fanfare on July 22 -- was gone. "JTF Support Hope completed re-deployment on 30 September and was disestablished on 8 October 1994 having accomplished the mission assigned by CINCEUR" (EUCOM 24)

There were some on the civilian side who saw the military as having withdrawn before the job the U.S. Government had "contracted for" was completed, and to have done so when it still was not clear whether the civilian agencies could gear up quickly enough to meet the military's timeframe (McKelvey). The U.S. military review of Operation Support Hope recognized such divergent approaches taken by the civilian and military organizations involved in the relief effort. The After Action Report also explained how the mission guidance through the chain of command to the Joint Task Force Commander allowed the military to prevail in the bureaucratic battle with the civilian organizations.

From the first the commander and staff were permitted to develop criteria that defined success in doctrinal military terms, resisted mission creep, and encouraged the rapid transition of relief support from military to USAID or other civilian

agency control. Other agencies, however, notably the State Department, USAID, and the UN/NGO community, had a longer view of involvement that, without specific limits, was roughly tied to stabilization of life in the refugee camps and nation-building activities (in some cases they had *no* view of end state criteria, as expressed and understood in military doctrine). . . Clear mission guidance thus permitted the commander considerable freedom of action in determining his operational objectives and end state, and was key in avoiding the additional taskings to deployed forces that has become known as "mission creep" (EUCOM 26; emphasis in original)

Secretary of Defense William Perry made similar comments at the first After Action Review of Operation Support Hope. After Lt. Gen. Schroeder made his presentation, Perry described the rationale and criteria for U.S. involvement which he had told the President: it is a major emergency; the need for relief is time-urgent, the solution is unique to the U.S. military, and the risks to U.S. forces are minimal. He said the same criteria would be applied to the next crisis. The mission plan was to save lives, protect U.S. troops, and pass the mission on as soon as possible to those who would normally handle it. He added that there had been great pressure in Washington for "mission creep," but the Department of Defense had dug in its heels and got out (Perry).

During a series of interviews with officials in the National Security Council, Defense Department, State Department and USAID, the author was struck by the emotional level of the discussion when describing events from a year and a half earlier. A few of the civilians described Defense officials as having been "disingenuous" during inter-agency discussions of the military's future plans for the operation, while Pentagon officials were adamant that their assigned mission and the situation on the ground in Zaire fully warranted the termination of Operation Support

Hope by the end of September. Clearly, July through September of 1994 was not a good period for military-civilian harmony in Washington.

Operation Support Hope in Broader Context

To understand fully the different perspectives of those working on humanitarian relief for Rwandan refugees, one needs to keep in mind events elsewhere which had an impact on the players involved.

U.S. troops withdrew from Somalia by the end of March 1994. The Somalia operation, despite its initial success in relieving famine, is commonly viewed in the U.S. as a failure. This stems, in part, from "mission creep" which occurred after the original goal, to alleviate the suffering, was expanded to include nation-building and later to arrest a particular warlord.

On April 6, 1994, a week after the Somalia operation ended, an unexplained plane crash killed the Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi and sparked the genocide by Hutus against Tutsis inside Rwanda. For complex reasons, the international community was unable to stop the genocide in the ensuing months. After the Tutsi-led Rwandan Patriotic Front took over Kigali, Hutus (including perpetrators of genocide) began to flee, and many of them were part of the refugee influx into Zaire in July.

By September, another part of the world was receiving great attention. U.S. troops prepared to engage in an American-led invasion of Haiti aimed at forcibly removing the *de facto* government. After a last-minute agreement, the Haitian military leaders agreed to step down and U.S. troops landed in a relatively peaceful environment.

These surrounding events affected those concerned with Rwandan refugee relief. From the Pentagon's perspective, it was important that Operation Support Hope be a success after the failure in Somalia. At the same time, there was to be no Somalia-style expansion of the mission. The humanitarian relief effort, which took place in a secure environment, had a lower priority in the Pentagon than the planned invasion of Haiti, which was potentially far more dangerous.

Many of the civilians, meanwhile, were greatly affected by the fact that the U.S. Government had not done more to stop the Rwandan genocide, which killed upwards of half a million people. One State Department official speculated that, had the refugees been Tutsi victims rather than Hutus (some of whom had committed acts of genocide), the civilians in the internal debates may have more strongly insisted that the U.S. military meet public U.S. Government commitments (African Affairs official).

Lessons-Learned Exercises

In reviewing the events that led President Clinton to order the U.S. military to undertake Operation Support Hope, one could easily conclude that the problem lies in the inadequate logistical capabilities of the humanitarian relief organizations. Perhaps, as JCS Chairman Shalikashvili suggested, donor governments should provide the United Nations -- specifically, the key operational U.N. relief agencies, UNHCR, UNICEF, and the World Food Program -- the wherewithal to undertake such a massive relief effort on their own.

Even in the richest of times, however, that would be a highly unlikely scenario. In today's difficult budgetary environment (affecting the United States as well as many other donor governments), it is simply impossible. The High Commissioner for Refugees will not have her own air force, or commercial fleet on-call for strategic airlift, anytime in the foreseeable future. Even if she did, there will be circumstances -- such as existed during the Sarajevo airlift -- where

the delivery of humanitarian supplies involves a security element that requires the use of military assets

Given that reality, many of the studies formulating "lessons learned" from the Rwandan refugee crisis have assumed that at some point the military will again be called upon to act in a massive humanitarian crisis occurring in a secure environment. Thus, the reviews have focused much of their attention on improving the civilian-military linkage

On the international level, e.g., the U.N.'s Department of Humanitarian Affairs (the organization within the U.N. established to coordinate emergency relief) chaired a U.N. task force in Geneva on the subject. The objective was to develop "a common framework to ensure the most effective use of military and defense assets in support of all types of humanitarian operations where their use is appropriate." The task force operated under two principles

First, any use of such assets should be exceptional, to be considered only when more normal arrangements are either not available or would not be available in time on the scale required. Second, all consideration of, and practical arrangements for, such use must be based on, and be perceived to reflect, solely humanitarian criteria (DHA Note).

The latter point expresses the concern of humanitarian actors, who believe that their ability to deliver humanitarian aid requires impartiality and neutrality, that military involvement in humanitarian operations "may be perceived as reflecting political rather than humanitarian considerations" (DHA Note). As a result of the task force's study, DHA is working to create a U.N. Military and Civil Defense Coordination Unit in Geneva to serve as a planning and operations focal point within the U.N. for governments, regional organizations and other institutions (DHA Task Force 6). The idea of creating such a focal point stems in part from the

view that the United Nations needs a single point with which militaries can engage in planning, which was expressed by U S Army General George A Joulwan, CINCEUR, during his 1995 visit to Geneva (Ressler)

For its part, UNHCR concluded that it would continue to utilize and would further refine the concept of service packages for self-contained facilities and services provided by donor governments to meet exceptional emergency needs. The organization noted that "the specifications for, and operating principles governing the use of such packages, should be agreed upon in advance" (UNHCR Document 6).

Among donor governments, U S. Ambassador Daniel L Spiegel chaired a November 1994 meeting of the Humanitarian Liaison Working Group in Geneva that featured Lt Gen. Schroeder. During the meeting, the assembled ambassadors raised several ideas that could serve as guiding principles for the civilian-military linkage:

- In a crisis situation where relief organizations are overwhelmed, military organizations can be called upon to use their unique capabilities (or their comparative advantage) until relief organizations are able to meet the humanitarian needs.
- There can be no automaticity to such a military response (given the principal role of military establishments to defend their countries) and this is understood and accepted by the humanitarian assistance agencies
- It is important to establish in advance appropriate coordination mechanisms between humanitarian agencies and military establishments in order to take maximum advantage of the military's unique capability: the rapidity of its organized response

- Advance joint training should include both military and relief organizations and aim to improve coordination, communication and definition of tasks requested of the military
- In humanitarian situations where governments decide their militaries should be involved, the military mission should be precisely and clearly defined both in scope and duration.
- The service package concept, if more clearly defined and in more manageable sizes, can be usefully employed again. Refined service packages should allow both larger and smaller military establishments to assume some of the tasks required
- The use of troops for direct delivery of supplies is often controversial, expensive and full of political complications. If used, there should always be a strategy to ensure their departure as soon as the situation permits
- The military's involvement should be used to leverage the participation of relief organizations (e.g., airlift to bring in equipment belonging to relief organizations).
- Unity of effort should be achieved through improved coordination, especially in sharing "real time" information and setting priorities.
- The operation should remain under civilian control...(Spiegel)

For the United States, the After Action Report from Operation Support Hope seconded the HLWG suggestion for joint training: "To preclude 'meeting on the dance floor,' U.S. military schooling and exercises should include representatives of other governmental agencies, the U.N., and NGOs. JTF/Unified Command exercises should include non-military representatives 'playing' their normal roles even in hypothetical combat situations (EUCOM 33)." In 1995, the Department of Defense took another step to improve liaison with the international humanitarian agencies when it created a position for a military "humanitarian affairs liaison officer" to work in the Refugee and Migration Affairs section of the U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Geneva.

The need to overcome anticipated difficulties in civilian-military liaison is recognized in the doctrine of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding military operations other than war (MOOTW)

in MOOTW, achieving unity of effort is often complicated by a variety of international, foreign and domestic military and non-military participants, the lack of definitive command arrangements among them, and varying views of the objective. This requires that JFCs [joint force commanders], or other designated directors of the operation, rely heavily on consensus building to achieve unity of effort (Joint Chiefs Pub II-3)

With its emphasis on unity of effort, the doctrine assumes that a basic principle of war -- unity of command -- will not exist for such operations.

The Military and Humanitarian Operations. Inevitable Involvement and Inevitable Clashes

The many efforts to improve military-civilian coordination should prove to be helpful in future humanitarian crises, particularly regarding military coordination with international humanitarian organizations. All parties need to recognize, however, that such measures in the United States will have only a marginal effect on the core issue -- the fundamental difference in perspective between the military and civilian (particularly humanitarian) organizations.

The purpose of the U.S. military is to fight and win the nation's wars. Military officers trained to have that mindset will inevitably find humanitarian operations to be a secondary activity.

The purpose of the humanitarian agencies is to protect and assist civilians in need, and their personnel on the ground sometimes risk their own lives to do so. Those in the U.S. Government

who provide funding for the international humanitarian agencies and NGOs are equally committed to meeting humanitarian needs

This difference in perspectives, a veritable "clash of cultures," was a continuing theme during the Rwandan refugee crisis, from the initial misgivings of the U.S. military about engaging in an effort which detracted from readiness, to the concerns among key Members of Congress that Defense funding was inappropriately being diverted to humanitarian missions, to the bickering between civilians and the military over the extent of the U S commitment to UNHCR and the termination date of Operation Support Hope. The differences are attitudinal and not readily subject to change through implementation of assorted lessons-learned recommendations.

Some observers may therefore conclude that the answer is to remove the U S. military from such operations altogether. Others may take the opposite approach and suggest that the military should be restructured and retrained to facilitate its involvement in humanitarian activities. A less drastic option would be to take steps to make the military more receptive to such operations. None of these measures is likely to succeed in the foreseeable future, however.

Those who favor removing the military from involvement in humanitarian operations ignore key factors. There are limitations on the capabilities of humanitarian agencies to respond to sudden, massive emergencies and in situations where there are substantial security concerns, funds to increase those capabilities in the humanitarian agencies will not be forthcoming; and there is a strong sense in the American public, facilitated by the media ("the CNN effect"), that the U S should be part of the international effort to alleviate suffering in such crises. "The United States has a clear humanitarian interest in preventing genocide and starvation, and Americans will support intervention to deal with such tragedies within limits" (Huntington 42). The U S. military in recent years has been ordered by both Republican and Democratic Presidents to engage in activities that have a humanitarian dimension. Operation Provide Comfort for Kurds in northern Iraq, the

Sarajevo airlift and the Unified Task Force for Somalia all were initiated under President Bush, while Operation Support Hope for Rwandan refugees, the intervention in Haiti and U S troop presence in IFOR in Bosnia commenced under President Clinton. Under extreme circumstances, the U S. military should, and inevitably will, undertake additional humanitarian missions -- even if doing so has negative consequences for, e g., military readiness

A different approach would be to restructure the U S military so that separate units are designated for peacetime operations such as humanitarian assistance. Even if this were the best approach to take organizationally (which is not at all certain), for the foreseeable future it would meet intense resistance. The downsizing of the U S. military in recent years accentuates the military's view that it must focus on the current strategy of being able to fight two major regional contingencies nearly simultaneously. Also, there is scant sentiment in Congress to shift even a bit of the emphasis from warfighting to peace operations, humanitarian assistance and the like. Proposals to organize and train the military for such activities, or to create a unified command for humanitarian assistance operations, are met with a strong rejoinder.

Such proposals are basically misconstrued. The mission of the Armed Forces is combat, to deter and defeat enemies of the United States. The military must be recruited, organized, trained and equipped for that purpose alone. Its capabilities can, and should, be used for humanitarian and other civilian activities, but the military should not be organized or prepared or trained to perform such roles. A military force is fundamentally antihumanitarian. Its purpose is to kill people in the most efficient way possible. That is why nations traditionally maintained armies and navies. Should the military perform other roles? Absolutely, and they have done so throughout our history. Should these roles define the Armed Forces? Absolutely not (Huntington 43)

Lt. Gen Schroeder, based on his experience commanding Operation Support Hope, argued that military restructuring was unnecessary ". this operation validated the capability of the armed forces to perform these kinds of operations without specialized training or dedicated units (EUCOM 2) "

Without restructuring or retraining, would it be possible simply to make the military more receptive to such operations other than war? As the Rwanda example showed, the military-civilian clash in the U S is based on different organizational perspectives, perhaps a more supportive attitude on the part of the military would alleviate much of the problem. Certainly, many military personnel have had experience providing humanitarian aid (even the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was once directly involved in Operation Provide Comfort). A major organizational shift in attitude is not an easy task, however. One observer believes that it could require "draconian means" for the U.S. military "to embrace nontraditional missions without inordinate anxiety ". These include coercion and "wholesale reeducation of the officer corps ". Coercion would involve assertive civilian control into the process of selecting senior leadership in the services, while reeducation would include revising the curricula at every level of military education in order to inculcate officers with "a new vision of international politics, a revised understanding of the nature of war, and a new doctrine for the use of force ". Such a program would meet great resistance, however (including a potential civil-military crisis), and it is argued that supplanting the warrior "mystique" with an attitude more pertinent to humanitarian and other peacetime missions could "lead to creation of an officer corps that loses its stomach and capacity for more orthodox military operations" (Bacevich 112-113). Given these considerations, a major change in the perspective of the Pentagon, as an institution, is not likely at this time.

Conclusion

The termination of Operation Support Hope by the end of September 1994 forced the civilian agencies to take over all aspects of the relief operation within a few months of the massive refugee outflow. Perhaps the presence of U.S. military support for a period beyond September 30 would have made for a better transition, but that subject is beyond the scope of this paper. What is clear is that the extent of the military role in refugee relief was the subject of intense debate in the U.S. between the military and the civilian humanitarian agencies.

As a result of the experience with Rwandan refugee relief, various efforts are underway to improve civilian-military coordination and cooperation on humanitarian relief. These should proceed, since there undoubtedly will be humanitarian crises in the future which require military involvement. Additional contacts between military establishments and humanitarian actors can bridge some of the large gap between organizational perspectives.

The new vision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the year 2010 uses the catch phrase "full spectrum dominance" to encompass the military's humanitarian role. "New concepts will enable us to dominate the full range of military operations from humanitarian assistance, through peace operations, up to and into the highest intensity conflict" (Joint Chiefs 17).

The 1994 experience with Rwandan refugees, however, calls into question the prospects for effective implementation of this vision. The military will need far more than "focused logistics" (Joint Chiefs 18) to be fully successful when it is selectively engaged in providing humanitarian aid. It will require stronger commitment from its leadership, stronger support in Congress, and closer cooperation with civilian agencies on both the nature and termination of its humanitarian mission. Nevertheless, even under the best of circumstances, the concept of dominance in Joint Vision 2010 will be difficult to achieve. The nature of the United States military, with its focus on warfighting, means that humanitarian assistance will always be viewed as a secondary concern and as a distraction from the real task at hand. This will inevitably result in clashes with the civilian

humanitarian agencies, whose primary mission is to protect and assist civilian victims and with whom the military must cooperate in any such action.

In other words, military and congressional misgivings, debates over commitments and differences over termination dates are all likely to occur each time the Pentagon is tasked, as in Rwanda, with providing humanitarian assistance.

Works Cited

- African Affairs official who wishes to remain anonymous. Department of State Personal interview 29 March 1996
- Bacevich, A J. "Military Cultural and Institutional Change " Peace Operations - Developing an American Strategy ed Antonia Handler Chayes and George T Raach Washington NDU, 1995. 103-113
- Borton, Nan. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance Personal interview 29 March 1996
- Clinton, William J News conference transcript Federal News Service 22 July 1994 1-3
- Fleming, Heather M "U.S. Steps up Rwandan Relief as Lawmakers Assail Pace " Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report 30 July 1994 2158
- Goma Epidemiology Group "Public Health Impact of Rwandan Refugee Crisis: What Happened in Goma, Zaire, in July 1994?" Lancet 345 (1995) 339-344
- Graham, Bradley "Pentagon Officials Worry Aid Missions Will Sap Military Strength " Washington Post 29 July 1994 A29
- Huntington, Samuel P "New Contingencies, Old Roles " Joint Force Quarterly Autumn 1993. 38-43.
- Joint Staff officer who wishes to remain anonymous. Department of Defense Personal interview 15 Dec 1995.
- Lippman, Thomas W. "U S. Costs Mounting in Rwanda, Caribbean " Washington Post 27 Aug 1994. A10
- McCall, Richard. Address Rwanda Pledging Conference. U N. Department of Humanitarian Affairs, Geneva 2 Aug 1994
- McKelvey, Margaret Department of State Telephone interview 15 Dec. 1995
- Perry, William. Remarks to Operation Support Hope After Action Review U S European Command. Stuttgart. 3 Oct. 1994
- Ressler, H Kirkby Telephone interview 3 April 1996
- Senior government official who wishes to remain anonymous Personal interview 8 April 1996

Smith, R. Jeffrey "U. S. Mission to Rwanda Criticized " Washington Post 5 Sep. 1994: A1+.

Spiegel, Daniel L. "Military Support for Humanitarian Operations - Ideas Raised During the Discussion " Memo to members of the Humanitarian Liaison Working Group. 21 Nov. 1994

Towell, Pat "Defense Bill Adds \$170 Million for Relief to Rwanda " Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report 30 July 1994. 2159

United Nations Department of Humanitarian Affairs "Note by DHA on the use of military and civil defence assets in UN humanitarian operations " Memo to U S Ambassador Spiegel 24 Nov. 1995

--- --- "The Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in Support of Humanitarian Operations " Report of the Task Force Geneva 27 Sep 1995.

--- High Commissioner for Refugees. "Lessons Learnt from the Rwanda Emergency." Document prepared for Executive Committee, Sub-Committee on Administrative and Financial Matters 34th meeting 7 June 1995.

--- --- "Urgent Requirements for Relief Operation for Rwandese Refugees in Eastern Zaire " Memo for donor governments, Geneva. 20 July 1994

United States. Department of Defense International Security Affairs "Response to Smith Article " Internal memo 6 Sep. 1994.

--- --- Joint Chiefs of Staff Joint Doctrine for Military Operations Other Than War. Joint Pub 3-07. Washington. 1995

--- --- Joint Chiefs of Staff. Joint Vision 2010 (May 1996 final draft) Washington 1996.

--- European Command "After Action Report, Operation Support Hope " Stuttgart. 1995

--- Mission to International Organizations, Geneva Response to UNHCR. Memo. 3 Sep 1994

--- Senate Committee on Armed Services. Hearing Department of Defense Briefing on the Situation in Rwanda 103rd Cong., 2nd sess. Washington: GPO, 1994

Vogel, Steve "U S Won't Raise Troop Levels in Rwanda " Washington Post 13 Aug. 1994

A12

Walzer, Gerald Letter to U S. Ambassador Spiegel. 11 Aug 1994

Note

Sources from which this research paper was drawn are all unclassified but some have not been cleared for public release